

REMARKS

Status of Claims

In the May 2, 2008 Office Action, the Examiner noted that claims 1-20 were pending, of which claims 8-10 and 15-16 were withdrawn from consideration. Claims 1, 4, 5, 7, 11, 12, 13, 14, 17 and 18 have been amended herein. Claims 8-10, 15, 16, 19 and 20 have been cancelled herein without prejudice or disclaimer. Thus, claims 1-7, 11-14, 17 and 18 are pending for consideration, which is respectfully requested. No new matter has been added.

Election/Restriction

Claims 19 and 20 have been cancelled herein without prejudice or disclaimer.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. 112

On page 3, item 3 of the Office Action, claims 1, 4-5, 7, 11-14 and 17-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants submit that the Specification provides support for the feature of "said devices of the other party including a device able to communicate simultaneously with said communication devices." For example, paragraph 0049 of the Specification states "as shown in Fig. 2 as an example, assuming that a plurality of communication terminals 201, 202, 203, ..., 20N exist as a device of the other party within a range able to communicate, a confirmation process of whether or not a communication terminal X exists as a device of the other party able to communicate within the range able to communicate is performed. In this case, **an inquiry signal is transmitted from the communication terminal 2, and a response signal is received to the communication terminal 2 from one or more communication terminals X** (= the communication terminals 201, 202, 203, ..., 20N) able to communicate" (emphasis added). In view of the above, Applicants submit that the subject matter of claims 1, 4, 5, 7, 11-14, 17 and 18 are supported by the Specification. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the rejection be withdrawn.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

On page 4, item 5 of the Office Action, claims 1-6, 11-14, and 17-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C.103(a) as being unpatentable over Huuskonen (U.S. Pub. No.: 2004/0078372) in view of Aholainen et al. (U.S. Patent No.: 7,102,640). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1, as amended, recites a "communication device including a plurality of communication functions corresponding to communication functions for devices belonging to another party ... wherein the identification information for specifying the devices of the other party is related by the specifying information."

Applicants submit that Huuskonen and Aholainen, taken alone or in combination, fail to describe such a feature. For example, Huuskonen, paragraphs [0032-0033] state:

During each of the encounters shown in FIG. 1, WCD 102 establishes a communications link with the corresponding remote device 104. Once this link is established, **WCD 102 receives identifying information from the remote device 104**. This identifying information includes a unique identifier of the remote device 104. ... In addition to receiving a unique identifier, WCD 102 may also receive the name of the remote device 104. This name may be set by the owner or user of the remote device 104 (emphasis added).

As shown above, Huuskonen describes that the identifying information is received from the remote device. Further, Huuskonen, paragraphs [0099-0100] state:

query parameter(s) that are entered in steps 528, 546, and 566 specify desired field values in records of proximity log database 354. **These query parameter(s) may include information that indicates one or more remote devices 104...** After the user of WCD 102 inputs one or more query parameters... the user may focus the query by selecting one or more focusing parameters in step 568. Focusing parameters place conditions on the desired field values specified by already entered query parameters. Such conditional parameters may place conditions on the retrieval of information in proximity log database 354 (emphasis added).

As shown above, after Huuskonen receives an identifier of a remote device, the identifying information is inputted as query parameters. Receiving a identifying information from a remote device and entering it as a query parameter does not equate to specifying the devices of another party and obtaining identifying information stored on the communication device. Accordingly, Applicants submit that Huuskonen fails to disclose "A communication device including a plurality of communication functions corresponding to communication functions for devices belonging to another party ... wherein the identification information for specifying the devices of the other party is related by the specifying information" as recited by claim 1.

Further Applicants submit that Aholainen fails to cure the deficiencies of Huuskonen described above. For example, Aholainen column 7, lines 24-34, to which the Office Action refers, states:

The four Bluetooth access point devices 140, 142, 144 and 146 and the Bluetooth mobile device 148 of FIG. 1A are collectively referred to here as "server devices", for convenience. In accordance with the invention, the server devices can indicate to the user's Bluetooth client device the type of service that the

server device has available by sending service/device icon information to Bluetooth client device.

As shown above, Aholainen merely discloses that the server device indicates to the client device the type of services available. Merely informing a client device of the type of available service, however, does not equate to specifying *the devices* of another party. Accordingly, Applicants submit that Aholainen fails to disclose "A communication device including a plurality of communication functions corresponding to communication functions for devices belonging to another party ... wherein the identification information for specifying the devices of the other party is related by the specifying information" as recited by claim 1. Therefore, claim 1 patentably distinguishes over the cited art.

Applicants submit that the above discussion will aid the Examiner in appreciating the patentable distinctions of independent claims 4, 5, 11-14, 17 and 18. The remaining dependent claims inherit the patentable recitations of their respective base claims, and therefore, patentably distinguish over the cited art for the reasons discussed above in addition to the additional features recited therein.

In view of the above, Applicants request the rejection be withdrawn.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

On page 12, item 6 of the Office Action, claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hama et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0039915) in view of Aholainen. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 7, as amended recites a "communication device including a plurality of communication functions corresponding to communication functions for devices belonging to another party, and... a data base part that relates the proper address information which specifies a communication interface for the devices of the other party to specifying information in the proper address information" (lines 1-7). Applicants submit that Hama fails to describe such a feature.

Hama, paragraphs 0064 and 0066, to which the Office Action refers, states:

the control unit 20 retrieves the registration contents such as the telephone number and e-mail address regarding the selected name "ABBOTT Emily", and has the retrieved contents overlaid on the screen 511 in a pop-up display, as shown in the screen 512... When the start key 14 is pressed while the screen 512 (or the screen 511) is being displayed, the control unit 20 switches the pop-up display to a pop-up display whose contents have been narrowed down to the telephone numbers, as shown in a screen 513. The telephone numbers in the registered content for "ABBOTT Emily" are the mobile phone

number "MOBILE: 09012345678", and the home phone number "HOME: 0663332222", so the control unit 20 has these two telephone numbers displayed (emphasis added)

As shown above, Hama merely describes a telephone retrieval system that retrieves phones numbers from a list. Mere retrieval of telephone numbers, however, does not equate to "data base part that relates the proper address information which specifies a **communication interface** for the devices of the other party to specifying information in the proper address information" as recited by claim 7 (emphasis added).

Applicants submit that Aholainen fails to cure deficiencies of Hama described above. For example, Aholainen fails to disclose "information which specifies a communication interface for the devices of the other party" as recited by claim 7. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 7 patentably distinguishes over the cited art.

In view of the above, Applicants request the rejection be withdrawn.

Conclusion

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 16/2/08

By: 

Ameet I. Patel
Registration No. L0353

1201 New York Avenue, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501